petitioners to produce along with their petitions statements of all transfers of property effected by them within three years prior to the presentation of the petition.

(*b*) There was no provision in the Regulation for expert examination of the account books produced by debtors or for punishing debtors who had produced false accounts.

In regard to the officers appointed under the Involvency Regulation, the member suggested :

(*a*) all receivers should be full time officers.

(*b*) receivers should on no account be permitted to keep with them the money realised by them for more than three days.

(*c*) receivers should take their commission only on distributing the amounts due to the creditors;

(*d*) the distribution of the assets of the debtors should be made by the court itself ;

(*e*) receivers and their staff should be given only actual expenses for their journeys ;

(*f*) receivers should not utilise for the purpose of one suit on behalf of the insolvent the moneys realised by him by another suit ;

(*g*) receivers should render monthly accounts of all moneys realised and expended by them ;

(*h*) accounts of receivers should be audited at least once in a year by certificated auditors;

(*i*) receivers should sell only the equity of redemption in respect of properties mortgaged or hypothecated by the insolvent and should take commission only on the amounts thus realised.

The member also suggested that insolvency petitions should be admitted only in cases where the debts exceeded Rs. 2,000. No man should be declared an insolvent who had not assets to pay at least As. 8 in the rupee to each creditor. Where the insolvency petitioner was a merchant, he should produce his account books and ledgers for the 3 years previous to the filing of the petition. A person who borrowed money knowing that he was insolvent or knowing that he was unable to pay it back should not be declared an insolvent. No person who became insolvent by extravagant means of living or irregular habits should be declared an insolvent. No person who had presented an insolvency petition and failed in the attempt should be allowed to renew his petition. The Insolvency Regulation of Travancore should be brought into line with the British Indian Act.

DEWAN'S REPLY : Mr. Bhagavathiperumal Chettiyar, the High Court have at present under consideration the question of revising the rules under the Insolvency Regulation and your representation to-day will be placed before the High Court.

25. The Travancore Press and the Government.

MR. A. S. SANKARANARAYANA PILLAI (*Member, Municipal Council, Neyyattinkara*) speaking about the repeal of the Press Regulation dwelt at length on the Freedom of the Press. He deplored that newspaper articles that should engage the attention of Government were not collected and printed by them. He could not find any necessity for the promulgation of a legislation like the Press Regulation, because he thought that the ordinary law of the land was sufficient to meet any contingency. The member could not also approve of the scheme of the Regulation, which in his opinion combined in Government the functions both of a judge and of a prosecutor. Nor could he approve of the way in which proprietors of newspapers were engaged to do printing work for Government. The proscription of the Tangachery newspapers was another measure which the member regretted and he concluded by requesting the Government to change their attitude towards the Press.

DEWAN'S REPLY : Mr. Sankaranarayana Pillai, I have listened with interest to the very beautiful essay you have read out to us to-day, and I am sure it must have occupied a lot of your valuable time in putting together what has so often been said

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

during the last two years. I may refer you to the proceedings of the Legislative Council on the 13th of August 1926 where this matter was discussed and settled. If you have not got a copy of the proceedings I shall ask the Secretary to send one to you.

MEMBER: Government should kindly reconsider the question. That is my humble prayer.

26. Legislation to regulate the system of inheritance among the Pulayas.

MR. DAIVATHAN KUNJAN (*Member, Nominated*) spoke about the evils arising from the absence of a legislation to regulate the system of inheritance among the Pulayas and suggested that a bill might be passed introducing the *makkatayam* law of succession among them. He next referred to the progress of education among the depressed classes and as a means of further encouraging the spread of education suggested that Government might devote their constant attention to the provision of midday meals to poor boys and also provide qualified Pulaya and Paraya candidates with appointments. Another concession which the member wanted was in regard to the development of Sanskrit education among the Pulayas with a view to enabling them to have a fairly good command of the Malayalam language. In this connection he wanted small scholarships to be granted to the Pulaya boys attending the Sanskrit school maintained by Vaidyan Mr. N. Narayana Panickar at Pulladu in the Tiruvalla taluk. Lastly, the member urged for the nomination of a representative of the Pulaya community on the Legislative Council.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Daivathan Kunjan, on the question of succession rights for Pulayas Government made enquiries of Peishkars and others and their reports have now come in and they are being examined.

As regards the point whether a knowledge of Sanskrit is necessary for speaking Malayalam correctly, let me assure you that although it is very nice to know Sanskrit it is not really necessary to speak correct Malayalam and there are plenty of people who talk correct Malayalam without knowledge of Sanskrit.

In regard to the Vaidyan at Tiruvalla where some boys are learning Sanskrit I shall have enquiries made and find out what is necessary.

Then about a member in the Legislative Council, it is too soon to say what is going to happen at the next Council. Government will first see what the elections are.

27. The desirability of extending the provisions of part II (Marriage and its dissolution) of the Travancore Ezhava Regulation, III of 1100, to the Makkatayi Ezhavas.

MR. P. K. KUMARAN (*Member, Nominated*) dealt with the necessity of extending the provisions of Part II (Marriage and its dissolution) of the Travancore Ezhava Regulation III of 1100 to the Makkatayi Ezhavas. At present these provisions applied only to the Marumakkatayi and the Misradayi Ezhavas. But the Makkatayi Ezhavas stood in no less need of such a legislation than the others. They constituted about a lakh or 1/7 of the total Ezhava population of the State and mostly inhabited the taluks of Meenachil, Todupuzha, Muvattupuzha, Kunnathunad and part of Parur. It was in the interests of such a large section of the Ezhava community that the member urged for the present reform. Neither marriage nor its dissolution, according to the practice now prevailing among this section of the Ezhavas, wanted any formality. Numerous decisions, among them 4 T. L. J. 15, 5 T. L. J. 398, and 6 T. L. J. 118 could be cited to show that according to the prevailing practice a mere declaration of intention was sufficient to effect a dissolution of marriage. This state of affairs had to be remedied. The general sense of the community was strongly in favour of it. And the remedy was in the hands of the Government who could, under section 2 of the Regulation, extend the operation of any portion of it to the Makkatayi Ezhavas.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Kumaran, I was not aware that the Makkathayi Ezhavas felt so strongly on this subject as I now gather from your representation. However I shall have what you say placed on record and examined by officers of Government who would be able to express an opinion upon the subject. Meanwhile, I shall also be glad to know from other sources as well what the Makkathayi Ezhavas really want on the subject.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly